DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's amendment filed 4/14/2009, based on several interviews with

Mr. Jeffrey Clark on Feb. 12, 2009 and April 14, 2009 failed to put this application

in condition for allowance (See examiner's interview for detail), has been

carefully considered and has been entered.

    Claims amended: Claims 1, 5 and 6.

    Claims pending: Claims 1-6 with claim 1 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Dugan (US Pub 2006/0165223) in view of Tan et al (US

Pub 2005/0172013) and further in view of Sylvie (US Pat 6,744,872).

    As to claim 1, Dugan teaches a method for realizing Intelligent Network

(IN) service *(fig. 3: Network management system 212 controls a plurality of*

nodes 204), comprising:

    A. configuring a table for saving nodes and a table for saving invoking

relationships, wherein the table for saving nodes is used to save the information

of nodes and the table for saving the invoking relationships is for saving the

information of invoking relationships between the nodes *(a table of Service*

Independent Building Block (SIDD) to be invoked during a given type of call

[0010]); selecting one or more service features from a combination of at least one

service feature, the combination of at least one service feature being divided

from an IN service and each service feature corresponding to a node type and

configuring one or more invoking relationships of the selected one or more

service features, saving the information related to the selected one or more

service features in the table for saving nodes and the table for saving invoking

relationships respectively *(there is a NOS master process 560 located on the*

network or the local node that interfaces with the NOS client object 558 on each

SLEE and includes all NOS class libraries for providing NOS services. When a

particular executing service needs to call on another service, it invokes NOS's

LRM 577 via the NOS client object 558 and the NOS name translator function

570 (FIG. 8(b)) to locate and select an instance of the called service, [0084]).

While Dugan teaches managing service processing resources employed

for performing services in response to service requests received at the service

nodes of an intelligent network and Dugan further teaches the invoking capability

during a given type of call, Dugan does not explicitly teach "each invoking

relationship involving a head node and a tail node, wherein the tail node is used

for calling the head node, wherein a node that is always a tail node is a primary

node and one primary node corresponds to one service user number;

Tan in general teaches the operational rules provided by the primary node

can be propagated in a hierarchical fashion throughout the grid to other nodes

(Abstract). In a bit more detail, Tan teaches a request for service is received

from the primary service node at the secondary service node. Service is provided

to the primary service node responsive to determining that the request for service

is associated with the primary service node, par. 0008 for the purpose of

providing the details associated with how service requests are to be handled are

propagated throughout the grid rather than explicitly defined at each of the

service nodes. Therefore, the infrastructure required in the grid can be reduced

as the operational rules can be automatically propagated upon registration of

service nodes with other service nodes in the grid, par. 0004.

Therefore it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Tan into the teaching

of Dugan for the purpose for effectuating the communication process in a

utilizing and infrastructure-cost saving.

While both Dugan and Tan teach receiving a service request from a user

terminal *(ISDN terminal, fax , telephone, see Dugan's fig. 2 and 3 and par.*

[0013]; and user included with the request 101 to the primary service node 110,

see Tan's par. [0030]), to the selected one or more service features, beginning

from the primary node and according to the order of the invoking relationships, to

implement the IN service which the user terminal requests *(Dugan: pars. [0023,*

0024); Tan: According to FIG. 5, operational rules are propagated from the

primary service node 505 to the secondary service node 510 which is registered

therewith, [0037]).

Both Dugan and Tan do not explicitly teach determining the primary node

based on the service user number corresponding to the service request; and

performing the selected one or more service feature respectively by each of the nodes corresponding to the selected one or more service features.

Sylvie teaches realizing services that includes breaking down, at least partially, each service to be provided in service elements that bring together processing sequences common to several services or interacting with other services, processing the call originated from a telephone network customer including transmission of a service request through the telephone network up to a service control point adapted for realizing a requested service, and execution of the requested service by the service control point, which includes setting up an initial information message and transmitting this message to other invoked services during the telephone call, the message containing a list of service element identifiers subjected to a preliminary authorization demand, a list of identifiers of information types that must be notified to the service from other services that were invoked during the telephone call (Abstract). Sylvie further teaches that the call control point having the appropriate SSF function processes the **service request containing the user number and the service number as well**, transmitting it to the service control point 11 for the requested service to execute the latter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sylvie into the teaching of Dugan, in view of Tan, to clearly define a list or a table of service features corresponding to the service user number that will present no

compromise in wrongfully invoking service. Thus it will protect the security and

no doubt increase the greater QOS.

As to claim 3, Dugan, in view of Tan, teaches the invoking relationship

involving

two nodes is a relationship of direct or indirect unilateral call (fig. 3 shows each

service node 204 is interact with the other).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dugan (US Pub 2006/0165223) in view of Tan et al (US Pub 2005/0172013)

further in view of Sylvie (US Pat 6,744,872) and further in view of Clark (US

Pat 6,560,326).

As to claim 2, Dugan, Tan and Sylvie teach the service feature. They do

not explicitly teach one or more service features comprise any one or any

combination of the features of: welcome message playing, language selection,

originating calling number screening, routing, time-based routing, date-based

routing, weekday-based routing, user-selection-based routing, proportional call

distribution, routing based on a circular way, authority.

Clark teaches one or more service features comprise any one or any

combination of the features of: welcome message playing *(Clark: Fig. 3 has the*

message service 48), language selection, originating calling number screening

(Clark: 900 number screening, col. 1, line 47), routing, time-based routing, date-

based routing, weekday-based routing, user-selection-based routing,

proportional call distribution, routing based on a circular way *(Clark: Fig. 1*

shows a plurality of Signal control SCP 20, exchange SSP 14 and transfer 24.

These are evident elements of routing methods) for the purpose of delivering the effective routing method in the communication *(fig. 4)*.

Therefore it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Clark into the teaching of Dugan, in view of Tan and Sylvie, for the purpose of clearly defining what type of service features a provider can provide to the subscriber. Furthermore it would be practical and cost saving to both provider and subscriber that the service features can be controlled and facilitated by the service combination manager.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-6 are still objected to as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to PHUNG-HOANG J. NGUYEN whose

telephone number is (571)270-1949. The examiner can normally be reached on

Monday to Thursday, 8:30AM - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571 272 7499. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CURTIS KUNTZ/   /Phung-Hoang J Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614   Examiner, Art Unit 2614